

Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.18; No.4/2016, pages: 1035-1065
Original research paper
Paper submitted: 26th February 2015
Paper accepted: 1st December 2015
doi: 10.15516/cje.v18i4.1774

Social Entrepreneurship Education and Its Association with Perceived Desirability and Feasibility of Social Entrepreneurship among Business Students

Irena Kedmenec¹, Miroslav Rebernik² and Polona Tominc²

¹Faculty of Organization and Informatics, University of Zagreb

²Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between social entrepreneurship education and experience in prosocial behaviour on the one hand and the perceived desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship among business students on the other. A sample consisting of business students was selected bearing in mind the possible implications of this study on business education curricula. The sample included 512 soon-to-graduate business students from five countries: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and The Former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia. Our results indicate a statistically significant positive association between the “know what” component of social entrepreneurship education and both the desirability and the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. The “know how” component of social entrepreneurship education is statistically significantly positively associated with the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Experience in prosocial behaviour has a statistically significant positive association with both the desirability and the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Our results suggest that social entrepreneurship education programmes should include gaining some experience in volunteering, activism and making donations. These activities focus students’ attention on social problems and empower them to find proper solutions.

Key words: prosocial behaviour; social entrepreneurship desirability; social entrepreneurship feasibility.

Introduction

A desire to counteract the growing inequality in the world resulted in many different initiatives, often grouped under the umbrella construct of *social entrepreneurship*. These initiatives include community entrepreneurship, social change agents, institutional entrepreneurs, social ventures, entrepreneurial non-profit organizations, social enterprises, social innovations, business at the “base of the pyramid” and many others (Mair, 2010, p. 3). The terms are different, but they have several common characteristics (Lepoutre, Justo, Terjesen, & Bosma, 2011). First, social entrepreneurs develop products and services that “cater directly to basic human needs that remain unsatisfied by current economic or social institutions” (Seelos & Mair, 2007, p. 244). Second, innovativeness tends to separate out those organizations that merely replicate existing solutions to social problems from those that offer improvements or even “pattern-breaking” (Light, 2006) solutions. Third, the sustainability of these solutions is ensured through generating earned income (Mair & Martí, 2006).

Social entrepreneurial ventures are gaining momentum in the European Union due to various public policies that recognize them as valuable providers of social services and work integration for vulnerable groups of people (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). EU member states have already created, or are in the process of creating, their national strategies for the development of social entrepreneurship (Ministry of Labour and Pension System, 2014). In those strategies, most of them emphasize the lack of competent human resources that could successfully manage both the social impact and financial viability that are expected from these types of ventures (Government of the Republic of Slovenia, 2013). Social entrepreneurship education could contribute to building these competences. This assumption is based on the fact that the individuals who received formal entrepreneurship education are more likely to be involved in early-stage entrepreneurship than those who did not (Tominc & Rebernik, 2012). Since social entrepreneurship is still entrepreneurship at its core, the same association can be expected in social entrepreneurship.

In the 1990s, there was a degree of scepticism towards the potential of social entrepreneurship education. “People cannot be taught to become social entrepreneurs. What can be taught are some of the skills social entrepreneurs need to help them to survive” (Leadbeater, 1997, p. 59). Nevertheless, already in the 1990s, the most prominent universities in the world, such as Harvard, Stanford and Berkeley, were the first to recognize the importance of social entrepreneurship education (Brock & Steiner, 2009). In contrast to Leadbeater’s opinion, today’s courses in the field of social entrepreneurship are numerous and aim to raise students’ awareness of different social problems as well as build up their competence and confidence to take initiative. As the famous Gandhian quote says, these programmes should enable students to “be the change they wish to see in the world”¹.

¹Gandhi did not write these exact words. The quote is a paraphrase of one of his paragraphs: “We but mirror the world. All the tendencies present in the outer world are to be found in the world of our body. If we could change

With the development of social entrepreneurship, new careers are appearing on the horizon (Drayton, 2002) and education systems should familiarize students with their new career possibilities and new approaches to business in general. As Mair (2010) emphasizes, including social entrepreneurship in the curriculum of business schools not only illustrates alternative career paths, but possibly increases the likelihood of some future social needs never coming into existence due to socially aware businesses.

This research focuses on the business programmes of five European countries: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, and Slovenia. Austria has adopted social entrepreneurship successfully as a regular part of its economy and society. Slovenia has come a long way in its regulatory framework, while Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and FYR Macedonia are currently in the process of developing one. The perception of Croatian students is that social entrepreneurship is a marginal activity of non-profit organizations or a component of corporate social responsibility (Perić & Delić, 2014). This indicates that Croatian universities are not sufficiently active in incorporating social entrepreneurship into their curricula. The recognition of social entrepreneurship has been better among Slovenian students (Ošljaj, 2012) since 2011, when the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia passed the Law on Social Entrepreneurship, which determines the conditions under which legal entities may gain the status of social enterprises.

The analysed business programmes have already included some aspects of social entrepreneurship education in their curricula, mostly as a part of their entrepreneurship courses. The goal of this research is to investigate whether the increase of social entrepreneurship education in the curriculum is associated with the rise in perceived social entrepreneurship desirability and social entrepreneurship feasibility.

Firstly, this paper presents *the theory of entrepreneurial event*, explaining why the desirability and feasibility of a certain behaviour are both important for estimating the probability of its occurrence. Secondly, we give a review of social entrepreneurship education and experience in prosocial behaviour, ensuing hypotheses about their possible association with the desirability and feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Thirdly, the methodological framework is explained and the obtained results are presented. Finally, the scientific contribution of the paper is identified and its practical implications are presented.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

According to the two dominant models of entrepreneurial intention, *the model of entrepreneurial event* (Shapero & Sokol, 1982) and *the theory of planned behaviour* (Ajzen, 2005), a person will create an intention to engage in a certain behaviour if the

ourselves, the tendencies in the world would also change. As a man changes his own nature, so does the attitude of the world change towards him. This is the divine mystery supreme. A wonderful thing it is and the source of our happiness. We need not wait to see what others do" (Gandhi, 1913, p. 241).

behaviour is seen as both desirable and feasible. In the *theory of entrepreneurial event*, Shapero (Shapero & Sokol, 1982) focuses specifically on the behaviour of engaging in entrepreneurial activity and argues that entrepreneurial intentions depend on one's perception of the relative credibility of alternative behaviours and one's propensity to act. This credibility refers to one's perception of some behaviour as both desirable and feasible. Propensity to act refers to a person's ability of initiating and maintaining goal-directed behaviours (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994).

Following the *theory of entrepreneurial event*, a person would engage in social entrepreneurship if he or she finds it both desirable and feasible. Since the term *social entrepreneurship* was not universally understood, Lepoutre et al. (2011) intended to capture its meaning by describing it as a business with a social mission. In accordance with this definition, the term *perceived desirability of social entrepreneurship* would refer to one's personal attraction to starting a business that solves social problems. Since people often see social needs but do not have the time, skills or inclination to do anything about them (Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000), they may find social entrepreneurship desirable, but not quite feasible. Therefore, the desirability of a behaviour is by itself not sufficient to encourage the actual behaviour.

The term *perceived feasibility of social entrepreneurship* is defined as a degree to which one feels personally capable of starting a business that would solve social problems. Without the appropriate leadership and guidance, some people who find social entrepreneurship desirable but not quite feasible, might even discourage rather than promote such initiatives.

People learn and shape their beliefs, attitudes and assumptions about the world from their earliest days under the influence of the environment. Since adults are, on average, less ready to challenge this received wisdom (World Economic Forum, 2009), research results and public policies support the stimulation of entrepreneurial attitudes through formal education from an early age (do Paço, Ferreira, Raposo, Rodrigues, & Dinis, 1998).

Formal education is one of the factors from the environment that strongly influences the cognitive process of career choice. Krueger (2009) emphasizes that the process of education should enhance both students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship (perceived desirability) and their entrepreneurial competences (perceived feasibility). He is talking about the shift from a novice entrepreneur's mind-set to an expert entrepreneur's mind-set, which requires a change in one's deep anchored beliefs and in the way one structures the acquired knowledge. The same is true for social entrepreneurship education. This paper will examine whether one's exposure to social entrepreneurship education is associated to the strengthening of the perceived desirability and perceived feasibility of social entrepreneurship. The following hypotheses are posed:

H1: Business students who engage in social entrepreneurship education perceive social entrepreneurship as more desirable.

H2: Business students who engage in social entrepreneurship education perceive social entrepreneurship as more feasible.

A career choice is mainly influenced by an individual's personal background and experiential knowledge (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Since social entrepreneurship is focused on helping solve a particular social problem, an experience in prosocial behaviour might influence one's perception of the feasibility and desirability of social entrepreneurship. Thus, it was decided that this research should examine the possible association between experience in prosocial behaviour on the one hand and social entrepreneurship desirability and feasibility on the other, bearing in mind the implications of these relationships on business education curricula.

Prosocial behaviour refers to any act that benefits another person or other persons (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005), including helping, sharing and cooperating (Batson, 1998). In this research, the focus lies on humanitarian work and civil activism. An experience in these activities could be associated with both the feasibility and desirability of social entrepreneurship. The desirability could be strengthened by one's exposure to a particular social problem (Cho, 2006) or by someone's direct request for help (Perrini & Vurro, 2006). For example, volunteering in rehousing projects for homeless people familiarizes volunteers with the fact that homeless people, even when rehoused, have problems with finding a job (Tracey & Jarvis, 2007).

One's experience in prosocial behaviour might also be associated with the perception of social entrepreneurship feasibility since it facilitates the creation of supporting networks (Cho, 2006) and relations with very diverse groups of people (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004), from vulnerable groups to social elites. Social entrepreneurs often have experiences in volunteering (Vasakarla, 2008) and/or experiences of working in the social sector (Shaw & Carter, 2007) before starting their social enterprises. Thus, the following hypotheses will be tested:

H3: Business students with more experience in prosocial behaviour perceive social entrepreneurship as more desirable.

H4: Business students with more experience in prosocial behaviour perceive social entrepreneurship as more feasible.

Methods

Below is an overview of the methods used for gathering and analysing data.

Population and Sample

The research sample consists of soon-to-graduate business students from 6 different universities in 5 countries: Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt (Austria), the University of Tuzla (Bosnia and Herzegovina), the University of Zagreb (Croatia), J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek (Croatia), the University of Maribor (Slovenia) and Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje (The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). A sample made up of business students was chosen because Vasakarla

(2008) found that social entrepreneurs usually had an ambition to serve the poor, promote literacy and strive for peace in society already in their student years.

Since the majority of courses on social entrepreneurship are offered in business colleges (Brock & Steiner, 2009), this sample of business students provided respondents with a higher probability of exposure to social entrepreneurship education compared to other student groups. Soon-to-graduate students were chosen because they were more likely to have been taught about social entrepreneurship in the course of their higher education.

In the data collection process, a total of 514 questionnaires were collected. If more than 25 percent of questions remained unanswered, a questionnaire was not included in the analysis (Cavana, Delahaye, & Sekaran, 2000, p. 316). In the end, the sample consisted of 512 respondents, with 63% of women and an average age of 22.8 years (SD= 2.5).

Data Collection and Analysis

A questionnaire was created in order to collect primary data on the feasibility and desirability of social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship education, and experience in prosocial behaviour. Originally, the questionnaire was developed in the Croatian and English language. It was translated and back-translated by bilingual professors at the local institutions, where it was administered with the help of translators. With prior permission from their lecturers, the students were asked to voluntarily and anonymously fill in the questionnaires after a brief explanation of the study's purpose. The data was collected in May of 2014 in Croatia, and in November and December of 2014 in other countries.

Since no measurement scales for the feasibility and desirability of social entrepreneurship were available in the scientific literature at the time when the questionnaire was being developed (2013), new scales were developed according to the reasoning applied in previous research studies on entrepreneurial intention (Lepoutre, Van den Berghe, Tilleuil, & Crijns, 2010; Liñán & Chen, 2009). The challenge was to measure these two constructs without mentioning the term *social entrepreneurship*. The reason behind this was the possibility that the students from different countries would assign different meanings to this term. Thus, a social entrepreneurial venture was described as a company that helps solve some social problem and emphasizes its social mission. The word *company* implied that the venture earned revenues.

The statements used to measure perceived desirability and perceived feasibility of social entrepreneurship are presented in Table 1. The statements were rated on a Likert scale as follows: 1 – I strongly disagree; 2 – I disagree; 3 – I neither agree, nor disagree; 4 – I agree; 5 – I strongly agree.

In the next step, the measurement scale for social entrepreneurship education was developed. In their examination of 107 social entrepreneurship courses, Brock and Steiner (2009) found seven essential topics in the syllabi: the social mission/needs, resource allocation, measuring outcomes, opportunity recognition, sustainable

business model, innovation and scaling impact. Building the measurement scale for social entrepreneurship education on these topics would be problematic because half of those are also a regular part of commercial entrepreneurship education. Instead, for our measurement scale, the emphasis was put strictly on those elements that specifically referred to social entrepreneurship.

When developing a course on social entrepreneurship, an array of teaching methods is available to choose from, such as traditional lectures, class discussions, the case method, and different projects, ranging from interviewing social entrepreneurs to writing business plans for fictitious social ventures or actually volunteering in social ventures (Brock & Steiner, 2009). Thus, the statements that were used to measure social entrepreneurship education are based on the teaching methods for educating social entrepreneurs summarized by Tracey and Phillips (2007) and they are presented in Table 1. The statements were rated on a Likert scale as follows: 1 – I strongly disagree; 2 – I disagree; 3 – I neither agree, nor disagree; 4 – I agree; 5 – I strongly agree.

The disadvantage of this measurement approach is that it relies on respondents' memories. Consequently, certain components of social entrepreneurship education which were objectively present in the curriculum might get omitted. However, at the same time, individual educational experiences are captured, which is important because elective courses differ between our respondents. Also, it often happens that all students do not participate in all of the activities that are offered to them. For example, sometimes there is simply not enough capacity to provide all students with an opportunity to work in a social entrepreneurial venture. Since the respondents are asked about their education during the previous three to four years, it is assumed that the share of forgotten educational experiences is not high.

Besides the components of social entrepreneurship education, the experience in prosocial behaviour of our students was also measured. A list of prosocial behaviours that might be experienced by the respondents was made, both in the area of humanitarian activities and activism. The items measuring respondents' experience in prosocial behaviour are also presented in Table 1. The statements were rated on a Likert scale as follows: 1 – I strongly disagree; 2 – I disagree; 3 – I neither agree, nor disagree; 4 – I agree; 5 – I strongly agree.

In order to form multidimensional and uncorrelated factors that could serve as variables in the regression analysis, a factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed (Fulgosi, 1988). Two factor analyses were performed: one for social entrepreneurial intention antecedents – desirability and feasibility, and another for human capital variables – education and experience.

In order to test the posed hypotheses, the extracted factors were used in two regression models. The dependent variable in the first regression model was social entrepreneurship desirability, while the dependent variable in the second regression model was social entrepreneurship feasibility. Explanatory variables were the same in both models and included social entrepreneurship education, experience in prosocial

behaviour and gender.

Gender was used as a control variable (0=women, 1=men), since gender differences have been noticed in studies on social entrepreneurship. Data from the United Kingdom (Harding, 2004) showed that women were more likely to be social entrepreneurs than men, while men were about two and a half times more likely to be commercial entrepreneurs compared to women. However, at the global level (Terjesen, Lepoutre, Justo, & Bosma, 2009), men are generally more likely to start a social venture than women.²

Results

The mean, standard deviation, median and interquartile range of each evaluated statement are given in Table 1. The items were evaluated on the scale from 1 to 5. Regarding the desirability of social entrepreneurship, the average values assigned to the three statements indicate that business students find social entrepreneurship desirable. However, the intensity of agreement is the lowest regarding the attractiveness of social entrepreneurship as a professional choice.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics

Construct with corresponding statements	Mean (SD) Median (Interquartile range)
A Social entrepreneurship desirability	
A1 - It would bring me great pleasure to start a company whose mission would be to help solving social problems.	3.7 (1.1) 4 (2)
A2 - Starting a company that solves some social problem represents an attractive professional choice.	3.4 (1.0) 3 (1)
A3 - Owning a company that emphasizes its social mission has more advantages than disadvantages for me.	3.6 (1.0) 4 (1)
B Social entrepreneurship feasibility	
B1 - I would be able to gather a team of capable people if I decided to start a company that would solve a particular social problem.	3.6 (0.9) 4 (1)
B2 - It would be easy for me to start and manage a company that solves a particular social problem.	2.9 (0.9) 3 (2)
B3 - I know all the possibilities for financing a company whose mission is to solve social problems.	2.7 (1.1) 3 (2)
C Social entrepreneurship education	
C1 - In college, I have learned about social entrepreneurship.	3.0 (1.3) 3 (2)
C2 - In college, we have analysed a business venture that solves some social problem.	3.0 (1.2) 3 (2)
C3 - During my higher education, I have worked in a company that solves some social problem.	1.8 (1.1) 1 (1)

²Women are more likely to start a social venture compared to men in Malaysia, Lebanon, Russia, Israel, Iceland and Argentina. There is no gender difference in starting a social venture in Latvia, the United States, Finland and China, but men outnumber women in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the West Bank and Gaza Strip (Terjesen et al., 2009).

C4 - In college, I have attended a lecture given by an entrepreneur whose company solves some social problem.	2.7 (1.5) 3 (3)
C5 - As a part of my higher education, I have launched a social entrepreneurial venture.	1.6 (0.9) 1 (1)
D Experience in prosocial behaviour	
D1 - I volunteer for a non-profit organization.	2.0 (1.5) 1 (2)
D2 - I actively endorse certain goals (activism).	3.0 (1.3) 3 (2)
D3 - I donate money to humanitarian organizations and/or specific fundraising events.	3.2 (1.4) 4 (2)
D4 - I sign petitions.	3.1 (1.4) 3 (2)
D5 - I donate blood, clothes, furniture or other items.	3.5 (1.3) 4 (2)

On average, the students seem to be neutral when evaluating the feasibility of social entrepreneurship. They are highly confident in their ability to gather a team of capable people, while their self-efficacy is lower when it comes to management skills and the search for financial funds.

Of the examined methods of teaching social entrepreneurship, we can see that learning the theory of social entrepreneurship and the analysis of social enterprises are the most common, followed by writing business plans for social ventures and attending guest lectures by social entrepreneurs. Finally, by far the least represented components of social entrepreneurship education are working in a social enterprise and launching one.

When prosocial behavior is concerned, students are the most active in making donations, followed by activism in the form of signing petitions. On the other hand, volunteering in a non-profit organization is not popular among the surveyed business students.

The first factor analysis encompassed the items measuring the desirability (A1, A2, A3) and feasibility (B1, B2, B3) of social entrepreneurship. However, only one factor was extracted. In the next step, it was decided that a fixed number of factors, i.e., two factors would be extracted. The results were improved and two factors were extracted, with their items corresponding to the theoretical assumptions. The complete factor analysis output of social entrepreneurial intention antecedents is given in Table 2.

Table 2

Factor analysis for social entrepreneurship desirability and feasibility

		Correlation Matrix						Communalities	
		A1	A2	A3	B1	B2	B3	Initial	Extraction
Correlation	A1	1.000	.499	.499	.508	.288	.236	1.000	.690
	A2	.499	1.000	.493	.322	.311	.246	1.000	.649
	A3	.499	.493	1.000	.314	.270	.319	1.000	.634
	B1	.508	.322	.314	1.000	.474	.318	1.000	.563
	B2	.288	.311	.270	.474	1.000	.406	1.000	.702
	B3	.236	.246	.319	.318	.406	1.000	1.000	.591

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.848	47.466	47.466	2.848	47.466	47.466	2.071	34.524	34.524
2	.981	16.350	63.816	.981	16.350	63.816	1.758	29.292	63.816
3	.747	12.454	76.270						
4	.574	9.561	85.831						
5	.474	7.898	93.728						
6	.376	6.272	100.000						

Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was 0.770, with individual KMO measures all greater than 0.700. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant (Sig=0.000), indicating that the data was likely factorizable.

The extracted two factors explained 63.816% of the total variance. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 0.981, which is lower than 1, but still satisfactory. Varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability. The interpretation of the data was consistent with social entrepreneurial intention antecedents, with strong loadings of desirability items on Component 1, and feasibility items on Component 2. Component loadings of the rotated solution are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Factor analysis for desirability and feasibility (rotated component matrix)

Items	Component	
	1	2
A1 - It would bring me great pleasure to start a company whose mission would be to help solve social problems.	.800	.223
A2 - Starting a company that solves some social problem represents an attractive professional choice.	.790	.157
A3 - Owning a company that emphasizes its social mission has more advantages than disadvantages for me.	.775	.182
B1 - I would be able to gather a team of capable people if I decided to start a company that would solve a particular social problem.	.409	.629
B2 - It would be easy for me to start and manage a company that solves a particular social problem.	.159	.823
B3 - I know all the possibilities for financing a company whose mission is to solve social problems.	.117	.760

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization

Rotation converged in 3 iterations

The only controversial result is with regard to the item *I would be able to gather a team of capable people if I decided to start a company that would solve a particular social problem*. It corresponds conceptually to factor 2, but it also loads on factor 1. Nevertheless, the loading is higher on factor 2. However, since the loading of the item on Component 2 was higher than the loading on Component 1 and since the item contributed to the reliability of the feasibility construct, it was decided to be kept. An evaluation of this statement does not depend only on respondent's characteristics, but also on the characteristics of those people the respondent is surrounded with. Also, it presumes that a social entrepreneurial venture is always a team effort. Therefore, this item should be rephrased in further research. Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978) amounted to 0.746 for the first factor named desirability of social entrepreneurship and to 0.667 for the second factor named feasibility of social entrepreneurship.

The second factor analysis encompassed items measuring social entrepreneurship education (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) and experience in prosocial behaviour (D1, D2, D3, D4, D5). The initial solution extracted three factors. However, items D1 and D2 were removed from further analysis due to their low communalities. The complete factor analysis output for social entrepreneurship education and experience in prosocial behaviour is given in Table 4.

Table 4

Factor analysis for social entrepreneurship education and experience in prosocial behaviour

Correlation Matrix										Communalities	
Correlation		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	D3	D4	D5	Initial	Extraction
	C1	1.000	.517	.082	.334	.077	.106	.122	-.011	1.000	.669
	C2	.517	1.000	.120	.375	.153	.162	.062	.081	1.000	.678
	C3	.082	.120	1.000	.132	.501	.134	.145	.088	1.000	.747
	C4	.334	.375	.132	1.000	.135	.143	.121	.067	1.000	.483
	C5	.077	.153	.501	.135	1.000	.101	.131	.131	1.000	.749
	D3	.106	.162	.134	.143	.101	1.000	.388	.409	1.000	.632
	D4	.122	.062	.145	.121	.131	.388	1.000	.331	1.000	.669
	D5	-.011	.081	.088	.067	.131	.409	.331	1.000	1.000	.678
Total Variance Explained											
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings				
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %		
1	2.294	28.675	28.675	2.294	28.675	28.675	1.838	22.974	22.974		
2	1.516	18.954	47.629	1.516	18.954	47.629	1.756	21.945	44.919		
3	1.287	16.086	63.715	1.287	16.086	63.715	1.504	18.796	63.715		
4	.700	8.755	72.469								
5	.691	8.638	81.107								
6	.581	7.266	88.373								
7	.487	6.084	94.457								
8	.443	5.543	100.000								

Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was 0.646, with individual KMO measures all greater than 0.580. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant (Sig=0.000), indicating that the data was likely factorizable.

Using the Kaiser criterion, three factors with eigenvalues higher than 1 were retained (Kurnoga Živadinović, 2002), together explaining 63.715% of the total variance. Varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability. Items referring to social entrepreneurship education loaded strongly on Component 1 and Component 3, while items referring to experience in prosocial behavior loaded strongly on Component 2. Component loadings of the rotated solution are presented in Table 5. Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978) amounted to 0.666 for the first factor, 0.664 for the second factor and 0.643 for the third factor.

According to Johannisson (1991), entrepreneurship education should consist of four components, namely, *knowing what*, *knowing why*, *knowing who* and *knowing how*. Since the component *knowing what* refers to basic knowledge and theories, the first factor was named *knowing what*. The third factor was named *knowing how* because its items referred to practical experiences of working in a social enterprise. The second factor was named *experience in prosocial behaviour*.

Table 5

Factor analysis for social entrepreneurship education and experience in prosocial behaviour (rotated component matrix)

Items	Component		
	1	2	3
C1 - In college, I have learned about social entrepreneurship.	.818	.015	-.009
C2 - In college, we have analysed a business venture that solves some social problem.	.817	.061	.080
C3 - During my higher education, I have worked in a company that solves some social problem.	.072	.084	.857
C4 - In college, I have attended a lecture given by an entrepreneur whose company solves some social problem.	.679	.100	.113
C5 - As a part of my higher education, I have launched a social entrepreneurial venture.	.086	.080	.858
D3 - I donate money to humanitarian organizations and/or specific fundraising events.	.142	.781	.035
D4 - I sign petitions.	.078	.725	.097
D5 - I donate blood, clothes, furniture or other items.	-.035	.770	.057

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization
Rotation converged in 5 iterations

Multiple linear regression was used to examine the relationships between social entrepreneurship desirability and the variables of *knowing what*, *knowing how* experience in prosocial behaviour and gender. The assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, unusual points and the normality of residuals were met. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

Summary of multiple regression analysis for social entrepreneurship desirability

Variable	B	SE _B	β
Intercept	.134	.054	
Knowing what	.142	.043	.142*
Knowing how	-.020	.044	-.020
Experience in prosocial behaviour	.202	.044	.202*
Gender	-.364	.091	-.176*

Note. * $p < 0.05$; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = standard error of the coefficient;

β = standardized coefficient

The explanatory variables were statistically significant in the model, $F(4, 489) = 15.806$ ($Sig.=0.000$), $adj. R^2 = 0.107$. The constructs of *knowing what* ($Sig.=0.001$) and the experience in prosocial behaviour ($Sig.=0.000$) contributed statistically significantly to the model. The regression coefficient of the construct *knowing how* was not statistically significant. Thus, the hypothesis H1 was partially confirmed for the *knowing what* component of social entrepreneurship education. In addition, students with more experience in prosocial behaviour perceived social entrepreneurship as more desirable, which confirmed the hypothesis H3. The impact of the control variable of gender was statistically significant ($Sig.=0.000$), indicating greater desirability of social entrepreneurship among women in comparison with men.

The second multiple regression model investigated the possible associations of the explanatory variables with social entrepreneurship feasibility. The assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, unusual points and the normality of residuals were again met. The explanatory variables were statistically significant in the model, $F(4, 489) = 17.024$ ($Sig.=0.000$), $adj. R^2 = 0.115$. Students with higher levels of *knowing what* ($Sig.=0.000$) and *knowing how* ($Sig.=0.000$) perceive social entrepreneurship as more feasible, thus confirming the hypothesis H2. What is more, students with more experience in prosocial behaviour also perceive social entrepreneurship as more feasible ($Sig.=0.001$), thus confirming the hypothesis H4. The impact of the control variable of gender was not statistically significant. Regression coefficients and standard errors are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Summary of multiple regression analysis for social entrepreneurship feasibility

Variable	B	SE _B	β
Intercept	-.019	.054	
Knowing what	.171	.043	.170*
Knowing how	.281	.044	.271*
Experience in prosocial behaviour	.143	.044	.143*
Gender	.031	.091	.015

Note. * $p < 0.05$; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = standard error of the coefficient;

β = standardized coefficient

Discussion and Conclusion

Today's pressing social challenges require people who are ready to act and prepared to implement adequate solutions. Business programmes in the analysed countries are beginning to reflect these challenges and they are incorporating elements of social entrepreneurship education. However, the courses which focus solely on social entrepreneurship are still rare, and social entrepreneurship is often only a small part of the general entrepreneurship education. Tracey and Phillips (2007) emphasize the importance of incorporating social entrepreneurship into traditional courses, where relevant, instead of teaching it as a stand-alone topic in a specialized elective course or a separate program. They believe this would legitimize it as equal to commercial entrepreneurship.

In accordance with this suggestion, the first finding of this research confirmed that students who were exposed to social entrepreneurship education (*knowing what* component), integrated into courses across various disciplines, perceive social entrepreneurship as more desirable. In addition, both components of social entrepreneurship education (*knowing what* and *knowing how*) are associated with the perceived feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Thus, this may indicate that the effects of social entrepreneurship education depend on the applied teaching methods. Today there are many teaching methods available. Currently, business students in the analysed countries learn about social entrepreneurship through lectures and analyses of social enterprises. Real-life working experiences in social enterprises are extremely rare. Thus, although the surveyed business students find social entrepreneurship desirable on average, their self-assessments about its feasibility are generally more neutral.

Souitaris, Zerbini, and Al-Laham (2007) found that the most important benefit of entrepreneurship education programmes is the inspiration for self-employment they generate. Social entrepreneurship programmes should especially consider the inclusion of purposefully designed inspirational elements, since social entrepreneurship does not offer attractive financial rewards. Educational programmes should strengthen the perception of social entrepreneurship as socially highly regarded work, especially in light of this study, which reveals averagely neutral student assessments of the attractiveness of social entrepreneurship as a career choice.

Secondly, this research shows that experiences in prosocial behaviour are positively associated with the feasibility and desirability of social entrepreneurship. The reason behind this might be that these kinds of experiences familiarize people with the *social-welfare* and *public-sector* logic, which are not part of the general entrepreneurship education. According to Pache and Chowdhury (2012), because of the hybrid nature of social enterprises, social entrepreneurship education should allow its students to acquire the skill of bridging three different institutional logics: the *social-welfare* logic, the *commercial* logic and the *public-sector* logic. Since the *commercial-logic* is omnipresent in the business studies curricula, business students have to step outside

their universities to acquire knowledge about bureaucratic principles and democratic governance, which belong to the *public-sector* logic, as well as the knowledge about improving social conditions, which belong to the *social-welfare* logic.

The results show that these business students are mostly active in making donations, followed by an activism in the form of signing petitions. Obviously, they are aware of social problems. However, they are not investing much of their time and skills to alleviate such problems through actual volunteer work. Universities should encourage students to engage in volunteering activities, especially in service activities, in order for them to recognize that many organizations could directly benefit from their knowledge and skills. Such experiences of seeing a positive impact of one's own efforts could boost students' self-efficacy.

The recommendations for the social entrepreneurship education development based on the findings of this research include the following. First, students should get out of the classroom and look for social problems in their communities. Such an approach should include volunteering in the social sector organizations or social ventures in order to gain understanding of the problem complexity. Dealing with the resources at hand, students should propose solutions or minor improvements of the current solutions combining *commercial*, *social-welfare* and *public-sector* logic. Second, the inspiration for social entrepreneurship should be created by lectures given by social entrepreneurs or by social ventures' beneficiaries that would aim for the affective outcome. Third, social entrepreneurship should be presented as a socially highly regarded profession, which of course depends on the public policies, but certain steps can be made through education. For example, competitions for best social-entrepreneurship plan could be organized with media coverage. Fourth, making donations is very frequent among students. However, the emphasis in the educational process should be on donations of things that are not used, which would raise the awareness of the business potential hidden in the re-usage of discarded resources, which is one of the basic assumptions of social entrepreneurship.

Although this study relies on the students' recall of the components of social entrepreneurship education, which is certainly a limitation, it is nevertheless a confirmation of the presence of social entrepreneurship education in business educational programmes and a verification of its association with social entrepreneurship desirability and social entrepreneurship feasibility among business students. It should also serve as an invitation to entrepreneurship educators and the creators of educational programmes to include the components of social entrepreneurship education in their work. Future research should report on the effectiveness of the used teaching methods so as to facilitate the replication of those which prove to be successful. In order to address causality, future research should apply pre-test– post-test design.

References

- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill International.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886304266847>
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2005). *Social psychology* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 282-316). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brock, D. D., & Steiner, S. (2009). *Social Entrepreneurship Education: Is it Achieving the Desired Aims?*. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1344419.
- Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L., & Sekaran, U. (2000). *Applied Business Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods*. Australia: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cho, J. (2006). Politics, values and social entrepreneurship: A critical appraisal. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 34-56). New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625655_4
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053>
- Do Paço, A. M. F., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviours and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-010-0071-9>
- Drayton, W. (2002). The Citizen Sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 120-132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166136>
- Fulgosi, A. (1988). *Faktorska analiza* (3rd ed.). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Gandhi, M. (1913). *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 13. Retrieved from <http://www.gandhiserve.org/e/cwmng/cwmng.htm>
- Government of the Republic of Slovenia. (2013). *Strategy of Social Entrepreneurship Development 2013 - 2016*. Retrieved from http://www.google.hr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&src=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0CC0QFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mdds.gov.si%2Ffileadmin%2Fmdds.gov.si%2Fpageuploads%2Fimages%2Fzaposlovanje%2FStrategija_socialnega_podjetnistva_-_sprejeta_na_vladi
- Harding, R. (2004). Social enterprise: the new economic engine? *Business Strategy Review*, 15(4), 39-43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0955-6419.2004.00338.x>
- Johannisson, B. (1991). University training for entrepreneurship: Swedish approaches. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 3(1), 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985629100000005>
- Kourilsky, M. L., & Walstad, W. B. (1998). Entrepreneurship and female youth: knowledge, attitudes, gender differences, and educational practices. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 77-88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(97\)00032-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00032-3)

- Krueger, N. (2009). Entrepreneurial intentions are dead: Long live entrepreneurial intentions. In A. L. Carsrud, & M. Brännback (Eds.), *Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mind* (pp. 51-72). New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0443-0_4
- Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
- Kurnoga Živadinović, N. (2002). Primjena faktorske analize u istraživanju tržišta za potrebe oglašavanja. (Master's thesis). Zagreb: Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Zagreb
- Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of social entrepreneurship*. London: Demos.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 47(1), 36-49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.36>
- Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S., & Bosma, N. (2011). Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor social entrepreneurship study. *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 693-714. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9398-4>
- Lepoutre, J., Van den Berghe, W., Tilleuil, O., & Crijns, H. (2010). A new approach to testing the effects of entrepreneurship education among secondary school pupils. *Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series*, 2010(1), 1-27. Retrieved from <https://public.vlerick.com/Publications/32770ac2-6aa9-e011-8a89-005056a635ed.pdf>
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 4(3), 47-51.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y.-W. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593-617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x>
- Mair, J. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: taking stock and looking ahead. In A. Fayolle & H. Matlay (Eds.), *Handbook of research on social entrepreneurship* (pp. 15-28). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849804684.00007>
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
- Ministry of Labour and Pension System. (2014). *Nacrt Strategije razvoja socijalnog/ društvenog poduzetništva u Republici Hrvatskoj za razdoblje od 2014. do 2020. godine*. Retrieved from www.stari-grad.hr/cms/content/clients/96/.../3964a.pdf
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ošljaj, I. (2012). *Prepoznavnost socialnega podjetništva med mladimi*. (Master's thesis). Ljubljana: Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana
- Pache, A.-C., & Chowdhury, I. (2012). Social Entrepreneurs as Institutionally Embedded Entrepreneurs: Toward a New Model of Social Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 494-510. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2011.0019>

- Perić, J., & Delić, A. (2014). Social entrepreneurship in Croatia: Do regional disparities influence young people's perception of social entrepreneurship as a potential career path?. *Ekonomski vjesnik*, 27(1), 81-92.
- Perrini, F., & Vurro, C. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: Innovation and social change across theory and practice. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 57-85). New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625655_5
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2007). Profitable Business Models and Market Creation in the Context of Deep Poverty: A Strategic View. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 49-63. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895339>
- Shapiro, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In C. Kent, D. Sexton, & C. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 72-90). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), 418-434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529>
- Souitaris, V., Zerbini, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566-591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.05.002>
- Terjesen, S., Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., & Bosma, N. (2009). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report on Social Entrepreneurship*. Retrieved from http://www.gemconsortium.org/assets/uploads/1349344229GEM_2009_Social_Entrepreneurship_Report.pdf
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740010340517>
- Tominc, P., & Rebernik, M. (2012). Gender differences in entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial activity in part of the Danube region. *Aktual'ni problemi ekonomiki*, 12(138), 496-505.
- Tracey, P., & Jarvis, O. (2007). Toward a theory of social venture franchising. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(5), 667-685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00194.x>
- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 264-271. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2007.25223465>
- Vasakarla, V. (2008). A Study on Social Entrepreneurship and the Characteristics of Social Entrepreneurs. *ICFAI Journal of Management Research*, 7(4), 32-40.
- World Economic Forum. (2009). *Educating the Next Wave of Entrepreneurs*. Retrieved from <http://www.weforum.org/reports/educating-next-wave-entrepreneurs>

Irena Kedmenec

Faculty of Organization and Informatics, University of Zagreb
Pavlinska 2, 42000 Varaždin, Croatia
ikedmenec@foi.hr

Miroslav Rebernik

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor
Razlagova 14, SI-2000 Maribor, Slovenia
rebernik@uni-mb.si

Polona Tominc

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor
Razlagova 14, SI-2000 Maribor, Slovenia
polona.tominc@uni-mb.si

Obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo i njegova povezanost s percepcijom poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva kod studenata poslovne ekonomije

Sažetak

Svrha ovog istraživanja bila je ispitati povezanost obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo i iskustva u prosocijalnom ponašanju s jedne strane s percepcijom poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva kod studenata poslovne ekonomije s druge strane. Uzorak koji čine studenti poslovne ekonomije izabran je imajući u vidu implikacije ovog istraživanja na nastavne planove poslovnog obrazovanja. Uzorkom je obuhvaćeno 512 studenata poslovne ekonomije na posljednjim godinama studija iz pet zemalja: Austrije, Bosne i Hercegovine, Hrvatske, Slovenije i Makedonije. Rezultati ukazuju na statistički značajnu pozitivnu povezanost između komponente „znati što” obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo te poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva. Komponenta „znati kako” obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo je statistički značajno pozitivno povezana s izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. Iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju ima statistički značajnu pozitivnu povezanost kako s poželjnošću tako i s izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. Rezultati upućuju na to da bi obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo trebalo uključivati stjecanje iskustava u volontiranju, aktivizmu i doniranju. Te aktivnosti usmjeravaju pažnju studenata na društvene probleme i osposobljavaju ih za njihovo rješavanje.

Ključne riječi: *izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva; poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva; prosocijalno ponašanje.*

Uvod

Protivljenje rastućoj nejednakosti u svijetu rezultiralo je velikim brojem različitih inicijativa, često svrstavanih pod zajednički konstrukt *socijalnog poduzetništva*. Te inicijative uključuju poduzetništvo zajednice, agente socijalne promjene,

institucionalne poduzetnike, socijalne pothvate, poduzetne neprofitne organizacije, socijalna poduzeća, socijalne inovacije, poslovanje na „dnu piramide” i mnoge druge (Mair, 2010, str. 3). Ti su pojmovi različiti, ali imaju neke zajedničke karakteristike (Lepoutre, Justo, Terjesen, i Bosma, 2011). Kao prvo, socijalni poduzetnici razvijaju proizvode i usluge koji „izravno zadovoljavaju temeljne ljudske potrebe koje uz postojeće ekonomske i društvene institucije ostaju nezadovoljene” (Seelos i Mair, 2007, str. 244). Drugo, inovativnost teži odvajanju onih organizacija koje samo repliciraju postojeća rješenja društvenih problema od onih koje nude poboljšanja ili čak rješenja koja potpuno mijenjaju stare obrasce ponašanja (Light, 2006). Treće, održivost tih rješenja osigurava se zarađivanjem dohotka (Mair i Martí, 2006).

Socijalno-poduzetnički pothvati dobivaju svoj zamah u Europskoj uniji zahvaljujući javnim politikama koje su ih prepoznale kao pružatelje socijalnih usluga i kao mogućnost za radnu integraciju ranjivih skupina (Defourny i Nyssens, 2010). Članice Europske unije već su razvile ili su u procesu razvijanja nacionalnih strategija za razvoj socijalnog poduzetništva (Ministarstvo rada i mirovinskog sustava, 2014). U tim strategijama većinom se naglašava nedostatak kompetentnih ljudskih resursa koji bi mogli istodobno uspješno upravljati i socijalnim učinkom i financijskom održivosti, što se očekuju od pothvata toga tipa (Vlada Republike Slovenije, 2013). Obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo moglo bi doprinijeti razvoju traženih kompetencija. Ta se pretpostavka temelji na činjenici da osobe s formalnim poduzetničkim obrazovanjem imaju veću vjerojatnost uključivanja u rane faze poduzetništva od osoba bez formalnog poduzetničkog obrazovanja (Tominc i Rebernik, 2012). Budući da je socijalno poduzetništvo u svojoj srži ipak poduzetništvo, ista se takva povezanost može očekivati i u socijalnom poduzetništvu.

1990-ih postojao je određeni skepticizam prema mogućnostima obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo. „Ljude se ne može naučiti kako postati socijalnim poduzetnikom. Ono što se može naučiti neke su vještine koje socijalni poduzetnici trebaju da bi preživjeli” (Leadbeater, 1997, str. 59). Ipak, već u devedesetima, najistaknutija svjetska sveučilišta, poput Harvarda, Stanforda i Berkeleya, bila su prva koja su prepoznala važnost obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo (Brock i Steiner, 2009). Usprkos Leadbeaterovu mišljenju danas postoje brojni nastavni predmeti iz područja socijalnog poduzetništva i oni nastoje ojačati osviještenost studenata o društvenim problemima te razviti njihove kompetencije i samopouzdanje kako bi mogli preuzeti inicijativu. Takvi bi programi trebali osposobiti studente da „budu promjena koju žele vidjeti u svijetu”, kako kaže poznata gandijevska izreka³.

Razvojem socijalnog poduzetništva na horizontu se pojavljuju nove karijerne mogućnosti (Drayton, 2002) i obrazovni bi sustav trebao upoznati studente s novim

³Citat je nastao parafraziranjem jednog od Gandijevih odlomaka: »Mi smo ogledalo svijeta. Sve tendencije prisutne u vanjskom svijetu prisutne su i u svijetu naših tijela. Kad bismo mogli promijeniti sebe, tendencije u svijetu bi se također promijenile. Kako čovjek mijenja svoju vlastitu prirodu, tako se mijenja i stav svijeta prema njemu. To je vrhovni božanski misterij. To je prekrasna stvar i izvor naše sreće. Ne trebamo čekati da vidimo što drugi rade (Gandhi, 1913).“

poslovnim prilikama te novim pristupima poslovanju općenito. Kako je Mair (2010) naglasila, uključivanje socijalnog poduzetništva u nastavni plan poslovnih škola ne samo da ocrtava nove karijerne mogućnosti već možda i povećava vjerojatnost da neke buduće društvene potrebe nikada ne nastanu, zbog povećane svijesti o utjecaju poslovanja na društvo. Ovo je istraživanje usmjereno na obrazovne programe poslovne ekonomije u pet europskih zemalja: Austriji, Bosni i Hercegovini, Hrvatskoj, Makedoniji i Sloveniji. Austrija je uspješno prihvatila socijalno poduzetništvo kao sastavni dio svoje ekonomije i društva. Slovenija je znatno razvila svoj zakonski okvir, a Hrvatska, Bosna i Hercegovina i Makedonija trenutno su u postupku razvoja vlastitih zakonskih smjernica. Hrvatski studenti socijalno poduzetništvo doživljavaju kao rubnu djelatnost neprofitnih organizacija ili kao dio korporativne društvene odgovornosti (Perić i Delić, 2014). To dokazuje da hrvatska sveučilišta ne rade dovoljno na uključivanju socijalnog poduzetništva u svoje kurikule. Prepoznatost socijalnog poduzetništva bolja je kod slovenskih studenata (Ošljaj, 2012) budući da je 2011. parlament Republike Slovenije donio Zakon o socijalnom poduzetništvu, koji određuje uvjete pod kojima pravne osobe mogu steći status socijalnih poduzeća.

Analizirani programi poslovnog obrazovanja već uključuju neke elemente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo u svojim kurikulima, većinom kao dijelove poduzetničkih predmeta. Cilj istraživanja je ispitati čine li komponente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo koje su sada uključene u dotične nastavne planove socijalno poduzetništvo poželjnijim i izvodljivijim u očima studenata poslovne ekonomije.

U prvom dijelu članka predstavljena je *teorija poduzetničkog događaja*, koja objašnjava zašto su i poželjnost i izvodljivost određenog ponašanja važne kod predviđanja vjerojatnosti njegova događanja. U drugom je dijelu dan pregled obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo i iskustva u prosocijalnom ponašanju s pripadajućim hipotezama o njihovoj povezanosti s poželjnošću i izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. U nastavku je objašnjen metodološki okvir i predstavljeni su dobiveni rezultati. Naposljetku se iznose znanstveni doprinos ovog istraživanja i odgovarajuće praktične smjernice.

Pregled literature i hipoteze

Prema dva dominantna modela poduzetničke namjere, *modelu poduzetničkog događaja* (Shapero i Sokol, 1982) i *teoriji planiranog ponašanja* (Ajzen, 1988), namjera određenog ponašanja nastat će ako osoba percipira to ponašanje kao poželjno i izvodljivo. U *teoriji poduzetničkog događaja* Albert Shapero (Shapero i Sokol, 1982) posebno se usredotočuje na ponašanje poduzimanja poduzetničke aktivnosti i tvrdi da poduzetničke namjere ovise o individualnoj percepciji relativnog kredibiliteta alternativnih ponašanja, kao i o sklonosti djelovanju. Kredibilitet podrazumijeva percepciju nekog ponašanja kao poželjnog i izvodljivog. Sklonost djelovanju odnosi se na sposobnost iniciranja i održavanja cilju usmjerenih ponašanja (Krueger i Brazeal, 1994).

Prema teoriji poduzetničkog događaja osoba će postati socijalni poduzetnik ako to percipira i poželjnim i izvodljivim. S obzirom na činjenicu da termin *socijalno poduzetništvo* nema univerzalno značenje u različitim zemljama, namjera je u istraživanju bila opisati ga kao osnivanje poduzeća s društvenom misijom, po uzoru na Lepoutrea i sur. (2011). U skladu s tom definicijom percipirana poželjnost socijalnog ponašanja odnosila bi se na atraktivnost osnivanja poduzeća koje rješava društvene probleme. S obzirom na to da ljudi uglavnom vide društvene potrebe, no nemaju vremena, vještina ili sklonosti kako bi nešto u vezi s njima poduzeli (Thompson i sur., 2000), oni mogu percipirati socijalno poduzetništvo kao poželjno, ali ne i izvodljivo. Stoga poželjnost nekog ponašanja nije dovoljna kako bi potaknula to ponašanje.

Percipirana izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva definirana je kao pojedinčev intenzitet osjećaja sposobnosti osnivanja poduzeća koje rješava društvene probleme. Bez primjerenog vodstva i nadzora neki bi ljudi kojima je socijalno poduzetništvo poželjno možda čak i usporavali, a ne unaprjeđivali inicijativu.

Ljudi uče i oblikuju svoja uvjerenja, stavove i pretpostavke o svijetu od svojih najranijih dana pod utjecajima iz okoline. S obzirom na to da su odrasli ljudi u prosjeku manje spremni propitivati prije usvojene postavke (Svjetski ekonomski forum, 2009), znanstvena istraživanja i javne politike zagovaraju poticanje poduzetničkih stavova kroz formalno obrazovanje od najranije dobi (do Pačo i sur., 1998).

Formalno je obrazovanje jedan od faktora iz okoline koji snažno utječe na kognitivni proces izbora karijere. Krueger (2009) naglašava da bi obrazovni proces istodobno trebao unaprijediti stavove studenata prema poduzetništvu (percepciju poželjnosti) i njihove poduzetničke kompetencije (percepciju izvodljivosti). Govori o pomaku od načina razmišljanja poduzetnika početnika do načina razmišljanja iskusnog poduzetnika, što zahtijeva promjenu duboko usađenih temeljnih uvjerenja i načina strukturiranja usvojenog znanja. Isto vrijedi i kada je riječ o obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo. Ovaj će rad ispitati je li izloženost obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo povezana s jačanjem percepcije poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva s pomoću sljedećih hipoteza:

H1: Studenti poslovne ekonomije koji sudjeluju u obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo percipiraju socijalno poduzetništvo poželjnijim.

H2: Studenti poslovne ekonomije koji sudjeluju u obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo percipiraju socijalno poduzetništvo izvodljivijim.

Izbor karijere obavlja se većinom pod utjecajem osobnog podrijetla i znanja prikupljenog iskustvom (Lent i sur., 1994). S obzirom na to da je socijalno poduzetništvo usredotočeno na pomaganje i rješavanje pojedinih društvenih problema, iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju može utjecati na percepciju poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva. Stoga je odlučeno da se u istraživanje uključi ispitivanje moguće povezanosti između iskustva u prosocijalnom ponašanju te poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva, imajući u vidu implikacije tih odnosa na poduzetničko obrazovanje.

Prosocijalno ponašanje odnosi se na bilo koje ponašanje koje koristi drugoj osobi ili drugim osobama (Aronson i sur., 2005), uključujući pomaganje, dijeljenje i surađivanje (Batson, 1998). U ovom istraživanju naglasak je na humanitarnom radu i civilnom aktivizmu. Iskustvo u tim aktivnostima moglo bi utjecati na poželjnost i izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva. Poželjnost bi se mogla povećati pod utjecajem izloženosti određenom društvenom problemu (Cho 2006) ili nečijeg izravnog upita za pomoć (Perrini i Vurro, 2006). Primjerice, volontiranje u projektima pružanja smještaja beskućnicima moglo bi upoznati volontere s problemom teškog pronalaženja posla tih ljudi, čak i nakon rješavanja problema smještaja (Tracey i Jarvis, 2007).

Iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju moglo bi utjecati i na izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva jer podržava stvaranje mreža potpore (Cho, 2006) i izgradnju odnosa s vrlo različitim akterima (Alvord, Brown, i Letts, 2004), od ranjivih skupina do društvenih elita. Socijalni poduzetnici često imaju iskustvo volontiranja (Vasakarla 2008) i/ili iskustvo rada u socijalnom sektoru (Shaw i Carter, 2007) prije pokretanja vlastitih socijalno-poduzetničkih pothvata. Iskustva te vrste mogla bi podržavati razvoj samodjelotvornosti i osvijestiti prilike za primjenu postojećeg znanja u društveno korisne svrhe (Dees, Emerson, i Economy, 2001; citirano u Perrini i Vurro 2006). Stoga će se testirati sljedeće hipoteze:

H3: Iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju ima pozitivan utjecaj na poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva.

H4: Iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju ima pozitivan utjecaj na izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva.

Metode

U nastavku je dan pregled primijenjenih metoda prikupljanja i analize podataka.

Populacija i uzorak

Istraživački uzorak činili su studenti poslovne ekonomije na posljednjim godinama studija 6 različitih sveučilišta iz 5 zemalja: Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt (Austrija), Sveučilište u Tuzli (Bosna i Hercegovina), Sveučilište u Zagrebu (Hrvatska), Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku (Hrvatska), Sveučilište u Mariboru (Slovenija) i Sveučilište svetog Ćirila i Metoda u Skopju (Makedonija). Izabran je uzorak studenata poslovne ekonomije budući da je Vasakarla (2008) pokazao da socijalni poduzetnici obično još od svojih studentskih dana imaju ambicije poput služenja siromašnima, zagovaranja mira u društvu i promicanja pismenosti.

S obzirom na činjenicu da se većina nastavnih predmeta o socijalnom poduzetništvu izvodi u poslovnim školama (Brock i Steiner, 2009), uzorak studenata poslovne ekonomije sadrži ispitanike s većom vjerojatnošću sudjelovanja u obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo u usporedbi s ostalim studentima. Uzorak je većinom obuhvatio studente smjerova poduzetništvo i menadžment. Izabrani su studenti na posljednjim godinama studija jer su oni imali mogućnost sudjelovanja u obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo tijekom svog visokog obrazovanja.

U procesu prikupljanja podataka prikupljeno je 514 upitnika. Ako na više od 25 posto pitanja u upitniku nije bilo odgovoreno, upitnik nije uključen u daljnju analizu (Cavana, Delahaye, i Sekaran, 2000, str. 316). Naposljetku se uzorak sastojao od 512 ispitanika prosječne starosti 22,8 godina (standardna devijacija 2,5), od kojih su 63 posto činile žene.

Prikupljanje podataka i analiza

Izrađen je upitnik kako bi se prikupili primarni podaci o poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva, obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo, kao i iskustvu u prosocijalnom ponašanju. Upitnik je izrađen na hrvatskom i na engleskom jeziku. Na druge su ga jezike preveli dvojezični nastavnici iz institucija u kojima se istraživanje provodilo, uz pomoć prevoditelja. Uz prethodno dopuštenje predavača studenti su zamoljeni da dobrovoljno i anonimno ispune upitnik nakon kratkog objašnjenja svrhe istraživanja. Podaci su prikupljeni u svibnju 2014. u Hrvatskoj, zatim u studenom i prosincu 2014. u ostalim zemljama.

S obzirom na to da mjerne skale za poželjnost i izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva nisu bile dostupne u znanstvenoj literaturi u vrijeme sastavljanja upitnika (2013), razvijene su nove mjerne skale, utemeljene na mnogim prethodnim studijama o poduzetničkoj namjeri (Lepoutre, Van den Berghe, Tilleuil, i Crijns, 2010; Liñán i Chen, 2009). Izazov je bio mjeriti ta dva konstrukta bez upotrebe termina *socijalno poduzetništvo*. Razlog za to bio je taj što bi studenti iz različitih zemalja mogli tom terminu pripisati različita značenja. Stoga je socijalno-poduzetnički pothvat opisan kao poduzeće koje pridonosi rješavanju nekog društvenog problema i naglašava svoju društvenu misiju. Riječ *poduzeće* implicira tržišnu orijentaciju.

Izjave upotrijebljene za mjerenje percipirane poželjnosti i izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva navedene su u Tablici 1. Izjave su vrednovane s pomoću Likertove skale od 5 stupnjeva sa sljedećim značenjem: 1 – uopće se ne slažem; 2 – ne slažem se; 3 – niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem; 4 – slažem se; 5 – u potpunosti se slažem.

U sljedećem je koraku razvijena skala za mjerenje obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo. Uvidom u 107 predmeta u kojima se poučava socijalno poduzetništvo, Brock i Steiner (2009) su pronašli sedam temeljnih tema njihovih nastavnih planova: društvena misija/društvene potrebe, alokacija resursa, mjerenje *outputa*, prepoznavanje prilike, održivi poslovni model, inovacija i povećanje utjecaja. Izrada mjerne skale obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo na temelju navedenih tema bila bi problematična jer je polovina tih tema također sastavni dio obrazovanja za komercijalno poduzetništvo. Naglasak mjerne skale trebao je biti stavljen na one elemente koji se odnose isključivo na socijalno poduzetništvo.

Pri razvoju predmeta za poučavanje socijalnog poduzetništva, može se birati iz palete dostupnih metoda poučavanja poput tradicionalnih predavanja, razrednih rasprava, analize slučaja i različitih projekata – od intervjuiranja socijalnih poduzetnika sve do pisanja poslovnog plana za fiktivan socijalno-poduzetnički pothvat ili volontiranja u

socijalno-poduzetničkim pothvatima (Brock i Steiner, 2009). Tako su izjave kojima se ovdje mjerilo obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo utemeljene na metodama poučavanja koje su predložili Tracey i Phillips (2007), a koje su navedene u Tablici 1. Izjave su vrednovane s pomoću Likertove skale od 5 stupnjeva sa sljedećim značenjem: 1 – uopće se ne slažem; 2 – ne slažem se; 3 – niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem; 4 – slažem se; 5 – u potpunosti se slažem.

Nedostatak takvog pristupa je u tome što se on oslanja na ispitanikovo sjećanje, tako da se neke komponente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo koje su objektivno prisutne u nastavnom planu mogu izostaviti. Ipak, istodobno se obuhvaćaju individualna obrazovna iskustva, što je važno jer se izborni predmeti ispitanika razlikuju. Također, čest je slučaj da nisu sve aktivnosti dostupne svim studentima. Na primjer, ponekad nema dovoljno kapaciteta da bi se svim studentima omogućila praksa u socijalno-poduzetničkim pothvatima. S obzirom na to da se pitanja odnose na prethodne tri ili četiri godine, pretpostavlja se da udio zaboravljenih iskustava nije visok.

Uz ispitivanja komponenata obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo mjereno je i iskustvo studenata u prosocijalnom ponašanju, i to u području humanitarnog rada i aktivizma. Izjave koje su mjerile iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju navedene su u Tablici 1. Izjave su vrednovane s pomoću Likertove skale od 5 stupnjeva sa sljedećim značenjem: 1 – uopće se ne slažem; 2 – ne slažem se; 3 – niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem; 4 – slažem se; 5 – u potpunosti se slažem.

Kako bi se došlo do višedimenzionalnih i nekoreliranih faktora koji će moći poslužiti kao varijable u našim regresijskim modelima, provedena je faktorska analiza s *varimax* rotacijom (Fulgosi, 1988). Provedene su dvije faktorske analize: jedna za poželjnost i izvodljivost, a druga za varijable ljudskog kapitala – obrazovanje i iskustvo.

Izlučeni faktori upotrijebljeni su u regresijskoj analizi kako bi se testirale postavljene hipoteze. Zavisna varijabla u prvom regresijskom modelu bila je poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva, a u drugom regresijskom modelu zavisna varijabla bila je izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva. Eksplanatorne varijable bile su iste u oba modela i uključivale su obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo, iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju i spol.

Kao kontrolna varijabla poslužio je spol (0=žene, 1=muškarci), jer su u istraživanju socijalnog poduzetništva primijećene rodne razlike. Prema podacima za Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo (Harding 2004) vjerojatnije je da će se žene baviti socijalnim poduzetništvom nego muškarci, a za muškarce je 2,5 puta veća vjerojatnost bavljenja komercijalnim poduzetništvom u usporedbi sa ženama. Ipak, na globalnoj razini (Terjesen, Lepoutre, Justo, i Bosma, 2009), za muškarce je vjerojatnije da će pokrenuti socijalno-poduzetnički pothvat nego za žene.⁴

⁴Za žene je vjerojatnije da će pokrenuti socijalno-poduzetnički pothvat nego za muškarce u Maleziji, Libanonu, Rusiji, Izraelu, Islandu i Argentini. Rodne razlike u osnivanju socijalno-poduzetničkih pothvata nema u Latviji, Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, Finskoj i Kini. Veći je broj muškaraca nego žena u socijalnom poduzetništvu u saudijskoj Arabiji, Maroku, Brazilu, Bosni i Hercegovini, Zapadnoj Obali i Pojasu Gaze (Terjesen, Lepoutre, Justo, i Bosma, 2009).

Rezultati

U Tablici 1. prikazani su aritmetička sredina, standardna devijacija, medijan i interkvartilni raspon svake vrednovane izjave. Izjave su vrednovane na skali od 1 do 5. Srednje vrijednosti izjava koje se odnose na poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva ukazuju na to da studenti poslovne ekonomije socijalno poduzetništvo smatraju poželjnim. Ipak, najmanji je intenzitet slaganja s izjavom da je socijalno poduzetništvo atraktivan profesionalni izbor.

Tablica 1

U prosjeku se studenti niti slažu, niti ne slažu s izjavama o vlastitoj sposobnosti za poduzimanje socijalno-poduzetničkih pothvata. Najviše se pouzdaju u svoju sposobnost okupljanja sposobnih timova, a samodjelotvornost u području vještina upravljanja i prikupljanja financijskih sredstava je niža.

Od ispitanih metoda poučavanja teorijsko učenje o socijalnom poduzetništvu i analiza socijalno-poduzetničkog pothvata su najčešće, a pisanje poslovnog plana za socijalno-poduzetnički pothvat i gostujuće predavanje socijalnog poduzetnika je rjeđe. Naposljetku, daleko najmanje zastupljene komponente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo su praksa u socijalno-poduzetničkom pothvatu ili njegovo pokretanje.

Kada je riječ o prosocijalnom ponašanju, studenti su najaktivniji u doniranju, a nešto su manje aktivni u aktivizmu u formi potpisivanja peticija. Volontiranje u neprofitnim organizacijama nije popularno kod anketiranih studenata poslovne ekonomije.

Prva faktorska analiza obuhvatila je izjave koje su mjerile poželjnost (A1, A2, A3) i izvodljivost (B1, B2, B3) socijalnog poduzetništva. Ipak, izlučen je samo jedan faktor. U sljedećem je koraku zadan broj izlučenih faktora čime su rezultati poboljšani. Izlučena su dva faktora s pripadajućim izjavama koje su u skladu s teorijskim pretpostavkama. Potpuni rezultati faktorske analize prethodnika socijalno-poduzetničke namjere dani su u Tablici 2.

Tablica 2

Uvidom u korelacijsku matricu utvrđeno je da su sve varijable imale najmanje jedan korelacijski koeficijent veći od 0,3. Ukupna Kaiser-MeyerOlkin (KMO) mjera iznosila je 0,770, a sve individualne KMO mjere bile su veće od 0,700. Bartlettov test sfernosti bio je statistički značajan (Sig=0,000) indicirajući da su podatci pogodni za faktorsku analizu.

Izlučena dva faktora objasnila su 63,816 % ukupne varijance. Drugi je faktor imao svojstvenu vrijednost od 0,981, što je manje od 1, ali još uvijek zadovoljavajuće. Primijenjena je Varimax rotacija radi olakšavanja interpretacije rezultata. Interpretacija podataka bila je konzistentna s prethodnicima socijalno-poduzetničke namjere, sa snažnim opterećenjima izjava koje su mjerile poželjnost na Komponentu 1, zatim izjava koje su mjerila izvodljivost na Komponentu 2. Faktorska opterećenja rotiranog rješenja prikazana su u Tablici 3.

Jedini kontroverzni rezultat bio je u vezi s izjavom *Mogao bih okupiti tim kvalitetnih ljudi kada bih odlučio pokrenuti poduzeće koje bi rješavalo konkretan društveni problem*. Ona konceptualno odgovara faktoru 2, ali također opterećuje i faktor 1. Ipak, opterećenje je veće na faktoru 2. Stoga što je opterećenje izjave na faktoru 2 veće nego opterećenje izjave na faktoru 1 te stoga što izjava doprinosi pouzdanosti konstrukta izvodljivosti, odlučeno je da će se izjava zadržati. Vrednovanje te izjave ne ovisi samo o karakteristikama ispitanika nego i o karakteristikama ljudi koji okružuju ispitanika. Također, pretpostavlja da je osnivanje socijalno-poduzetničkog pothvata uvijek rezultat timskog rada. Stoga bi ta izjava trebala biti preoblikovana u budućem istraživanju. Cronbachov alfa-koeficijent (Nunnally, 1978) iznosio je 0,746 za prvi faktor nazvan poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva i 0,667 za drugi faktor nazvan izvodljivost socijalnog poduzetništva.

Tablica 3

Druga faktorska analiza obuhvatila je izjave koje mjere obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) i iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju (D1, D2, D3, D4, D5). Inicijalno rješenje izlučilo je tri faktora. Izjave D1 i D2 su isključene iz daljnje analize zbog niskih pripadajućih komunaliteta. Cjeloviti rezultati faktorske analize za obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo i iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju dani su u Tablici 4.

Tablica 4

Uvid u korelacijsku matricu pokazao je da sve varijable imaju najmanje jedan korelacijski koeficijent veći od 0.3. Ukupna Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) mjera iznosi 0.646, sa svim individualnim KMO mjerama većima od 0.580. Bartlettov test sfernosti bio je statistički značajan (Sig=0.000) i ukazivao je na pogodnost podataka za faktorsku analizu.

Primjenom Kaiserova kriterija zadržana su tri faktora sa svojstvenom vrijednošću većom od 1 (Kurnoga Živadinović, 2002), koji zajedno objašnjavaju 63,715 % ukupne varijance. Izjave koje se odnose na obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo snažno su opteretile Komponentu 1 i Komponentu 3, a izjave koje se odnose na iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju snažno su opteretile Komponentu 2. Faktorska opterećenja rotiranog rješenja predstavljena su u Tablici 5. Cronbachov alfa-koeficijent (Nunnally, 1978) iznosio je 0,666 za prvi faktor, 0,664 za drugi faktor i 0,643 za treći faktor.

Prema Johannissonu (1991), poduzetničko bi obrazovanje trebalo sadržavati četiri komponente: *znati što*, *znati zašto*, *znati tko* i *znati kako*. S obzirom na to da komponenta *znati što* sadrži temeljna znanja i teorije, prvi faktor je nazvan *znati što*. Naziv trećeg faktora je *znati kako* budući da se pripadajuće izjave odnose na iskustvo rada u socijalnom poduzeću. Drugi je faktor nazvan *iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju*.

Tablica 5

Primijenjena je višestruka linearna regresija kako bi se ispitali odnosi između poželjnosti socijalnog poduzetništva i varijabli znati što, znati kako, iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju i spol. Zadovoljene su pretpostavke linearnosti, homoskedastičnosti, ekstrema i normalnosti reziduala. Regresijski koeficijenti i standardne pogreške mogu se naći u Tablici 6.

Tablica 6

Eksplanatorne varijable statistički su značajne u modelu, $F(4, 489)=15,806$ ($Sig.=0,000$), prilagođeni $R^2=0,107$. Konstrukt *znati što* ($Sig.=0,001$) i iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju ($Sig.=0,000$) statistički su značajno doprinijeli modelu. Regresijski koeficijent konstrukta *znati kako* nije bio statistički značajan. Stoga je hipoteza H1 djelomično potvrđena za komponentu *znati što* obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo. Nadalje, studenti s više iskustva u prosocijalnom ponašanju percipirali su socijalno poduzetništvo kao poželjnije, što je potvrdilo hipotezu H3. Utjecaj kontrolne varijable spol bio je statistički značajan ($Sig.=0,000$), indicirajući veću poželjnost socijalnog poduzetništva među ženama u usporedbi s muškarcima.

Drugi model višestruke regresije ispitivao je moguće povezanosti eksplanatornih varijabli s izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. Pretpostavke linearnosti, homoskedastičnosti, ekstrema i normalnosti reziduala su zadovoljene. Eksplanatorne varijable su statistički značajne u modelu, $F(4, 489) = 17,024$ ($Sig.=0,000$), prilagođeni $R^2=0,115$. Studenti s višim razinama *znati što* ($Sig.=0,000$) i *znati kako* ($Sig.=0,000$) percipiraju socijalno poduzetništvo izvodljivijim, što potvrđuje hipotezu H2. Štoviše, studenti s više iskustva u prosocijalnom ponašanju percipiraju socijalno poduzetništvo kao izvodljivije ($Sig.=0,001$), što potvrđuje hipotezu H4. Utjecaj kontrolne varijable spol nije bio statistički značajan. Regresijski koeficijenti i standardne pogreške mogu se naći u Tablici 7.

Tablica 7

Rasprava i zaključak

Gorući društveni izazovi današnjice zahtijevaju ljude koji su spremni djelovati i primjenjivati prikladna rješenja. Postojeći programi poslovne ekonomije u analiziranim zemljama počeli su odražavati te potrebe i uključivati elemente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo. Ipak, rijetki su predmeti koji se usredotočuju isključivo na socijalno poduzetništvo, stoga je socijalno poduzetništvo često tek manji dio općeg poduzetničkog obrazovanja. Tracey i Phillips (2007) naglašavaju važnost uključivanja socijalnog poduzetništva u tradicionalne predmete, na relevantna mjesta, umjesto njegova poučavanja u zasebnim izbornim predmetima ili odvojenim programima. Smatraju da bi to socijalno poduzetništvo legitimiziralo kao ravnopravno komercijalnom poduzetništvu.

U skladu s tim stavom prvi je rezultat ovog istraživanja potvrdio da studenti koji su bili izloženi obrazovanju za socijalno poduzetništvo (komponenti *znati što*)

integriranom u različite predmete unutar nastavnog plana percipiraju socijalno poduzetništvo poželjnijim. Nadalje, obje komponente obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo (*znati što* i *znati kako*) povezane su s percipiranom izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. Takvi rezultati mogu ukazivati na to da učinci obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo ovise o apliciranim metodama poučavanja. Danas su dostupne mnoge metode poučavanja. Trenutno studenti poslovne ekonomije u analiziranim zemljama uče o socijalnom poduzetništvu uglavnom putem predavanja i analize socijalnih poduzeća. Radna iskustva studenata u socijalnim poduzećima iznimno su rijetka. Stoga, iako anketirani studenti poslovne ekonomije u prosjeku smatraju socijalno poduzetništvo poželjnijim, njihove su procjene izvodljivosti socijalnog poduzetništva u cjelini ipak neutralne.

Souitaris, Zerbinati i Al-Laham (2007) dokazali su da je najvažnija dobrobit programa poduzetničkog obrazovanja to što daju inspiraciju za samozapošljavanje. Programi obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo trebali bi osobito razmotriti uključivanje posebno oblikovanih inspirativnih elemenata, s obzirom na činjenicu da socijalno poduzetništvo ne pruža atraktivne financijske nagrade. Obrazovni program bi trebao ojačati percepciju socijalnog poduzetništva kao visoko cijenjenog posla koji donosi osobno zadovoljstvo. To je osobito važno u svjetlu rezultata ovog istraživanja, koje pokazuje neutralnost stavova studenata prema atraktivnosti socijalnog poduzetništva kao izbora profesije.

Nadalje, istraživanje je pokazalo da je iskustvo u prosocijalnom ponašanju pozitivno povezano i s poželjnošću i s izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva. Objašnjenje te povezanosti moglo bi se kriti u činjenici da iskustva te vrste upoznaju osobu s *logikom socijalne skrbi* i *logikom javnog sektora*, koje nisu sastavni dio općeg poduzetničkog obrazovanja. Zbog velikog broja dionika i istodobnog ostvarivanja socijalnih i financijskih ciljeva, odgovornost socijalnog poduzetnika je vrlo kompleksna (Tracey i Phillips, 2007). Pache i Chowdhury (2012) tvrde da bi zbog hibridne prirode socijalnog poduzeća, obrazovanje za socijalno poduzetništvo trebalo omogućiti studentima stjecanje vještine povezivanja triju različitih institucionalnih logika: *logike socijalne skrbi*, *komercijalne logike* i *logike javnog sektora*. Dok je *komercijalna logika*, koja se odnosi na stvaranje i prisvajanje profita prodajom proizvoda i usluga, prisutna u nastavnom planu studija poslovne ekonomije, studenti u mnogim zemljama moraju izvan sveučilišta stjecati znanja o principima birokracije i demokratskom upravljanju, koja pripadaju *logici javnog sektora*, te znanja o unaprjeđivanju socijalnih uvjeta, koja pripadaju *logici socijalne skrbi*.

Rezultati pokazuju da su studenti poslovne ekonomije najaktivniji u doniranju, a nakon toga u aktivizmu, i to u obliku potpisivanja peticija. Stoga su, čini se, svjesni socijalnih problema. Ipak, ne ulažu mnogo svog vremena i vještina u ublažavanje tih problema putem volonterskog rada. Sveučilišta bi trebala potaknuti studente na uključivanje u volonterske aktivnosti, osobito u aktivnosti društveno korisnog učenja, kako bi studenti spoznali da mnoge organizacije mogu imati izravne koristi od

njihovih znanja i vještina. Takva iskustva pozitivnih učinaka vlastitih napora snažno potiču studentsku samodjelotvornost.

Preporuke za razvoj obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo utemeljene na rezultatima ovog istraživanja su sljedeće. Prvo, studenti bi trebali izaći iz učionica i potražiti društvene probleme u svojim zajednicama. Takav bi pristup obuhvatio volontiranje u organizacijama društvenog sektora ili u socijalnim poduzećima s ciljem stjecanja razumijevanja kompleksnosti problema. Koristeći se raspoloživim resursima, studenti bi trebali predložiti rješenja ili mala poboljšanja trenutnih rješenja kombinirajući *komercijalnu logiku*, *logiku socijalne skrbi* i *logiku javnog sektora*. Drugo, predavanja socijalnih poduzetnika ili korisnika socijalnih poduzeća trebala bi inspirirati studente i ciljati na afektivan ishod. Treće, socijalno poduzetništvo se treba predstaviti kao profesija koja se cijeni u društvu, što naravno ovisi o javnim politikama, ali se određeni koraci mogu napraviti i putem obrazovanja. Primjerice, mogu se organizirati i medijski popratiti natjecanja za najbolji socijalno-poduzetnički plan. Četvrto, studenti često doniraju. Ipak, naglasak u obrazovnom procesu trebao bi biti na doniranju stvari koje se ne koriste, što bi podiglo svijest o poslovnom potencijalu skrivenom u ponovnoj upotrebi odbačenih resursa, a to je jedna od temeljnih pretpostavki socijalnog poduzetništva.

Iako se ovo istraživanje oslanja na sjećanje studenata o komponentama obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo, što je njegovo ograničenje, ono ipak predstavlja potvrdu prisutnosti obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo u programima poslovne ekonomije i potvrdu njegove povezanosti s poželjnošću i izvodljivošću socijalnog poduzetništva među studentima poslovne ekonomije. Također bi trebalo poslužiti kao poziv nastavnicima i kreatorima obrazovnih programa na uključivanje komponenata obrazovanja za socijalno poduzetništvo u nastavne planove. Buduća istraživanja bi trebala izvijestiti o učinkovitosti upotrijebljenih metoda poučavanja kako bi se podržala primjena onih koje se pokažu uspješnima. Kako bi se istražila kauzalnost, buduća istraživanja trebala bi primijeniti *predtest-posttest* dizajn.